IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANTONY DOMINIC

TUESDAY, THE 11TH DECEMBER 2007 / 20TH AGRAHAYANA 1929

WP(C).No. 36530 of 2007(W)

PETITIONER:

ASSANKOYA P., S/O. KOYAMU,
NELLIPPULATH HOUSE, CHELANNUR P.O., KOZHIKODE.

BY ADV. SRI.R.RAMADAS

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. THE HOSPITAL DEVELOPMENT SOCIETY,
   REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
   MEDICAL COLLEGE HOSPITAL, KOZHIKODE.

2. THE SUPERINTENDENT,
   MEDICAL COLLEGE HOSPITAL, KOZHIKODE.

3. THE KERALA STATE HANDICAPPED PERSONS'
   WELFARE CORPORATION LTD. (A GOVERNMENT OF KERALA
   UNDERTAKING), POOJAPPURA,THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695012
   REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 11/12/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

ANTONY DOMINIC, J.

W.P.(C) 36530 of 2007

Dated: December 11, 2007

JUDGMENT

Petitioner submits that he is in receipt of financial assistance from the 3rd respondent under Ext.P1 scheme. Availing of such benefit, the petitioner is proposing to install coffee/tea vending machines in the premises of the Calicut Medical College. Seeking permission in this behalf, petitioner has made Ext.P3 application to the 2nd respondent and orders have not been passed on the said application even as on today. It is also pointed out that in the meanwhile the 3rd respondent Corporation has submitted Exts.P4 and P5 representations to the 2nd respondent recommending the case of the petitioner for permitting him to install coffee/tea vending machines. In view of the delay in considering Ext.P3 in the light of Exts.P4 and P5,this writ petition has been filed by the petitioner.

2. Since what the petitioner is seeking is a permission for installation of coffee/tea vending machines, which is based also on

the recommendation of the 3rd respondent, I see no justification for the 2nd respondent to delay the decision on Ext.P3.

3. In view of the above, I dispose of this writ petition directing that the 2nd respondent shall take a decision on Ext.P3 representation made by the petitioner as expeditiously as possible, at any rate, within four weeks of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

Petitioner shall produce a copy of this judgment before the 2nd respondent for compliance.

ANTONY DOMINIC, JUDGE

mt/-